

Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Serial No. 09/518,753
Page 12

REMARKS

In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. The Applicants believe that all of the presented claims are in allowable form.

I. REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-6, AND 9-34 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 1-6, 9-31 and 34

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9-31 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Gupta et al. patent (United States Patent No. 6,763,384, Issued July 13, 2004, hereinafter "Gupta") In view of the Boyle et al. patent (United States Patent No. 6,665,711, issued December 16, 2003, hereinafter "Boyle"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, the Applicants submit that Gupta is not proper prior art against Applicants' application. Specifically, Applicants' application was filed on March 3, 2000 and claims priority to at least one provisional patent application filed on December 8, 1999 (United States Provisional Patent Application No. 60/169,972), as well as to a parent case filed on June 1, 1998 (now United States Patent No. 6,263,360, Issued July 17, 2001). All of these priority dates predate the filing date of Gupta (July 10, 2000). As such, the Applicants submit that Gupta can not properly be used to support a rejection of the Applicants' claims under 35 U.S.C. §103.

As is evidenced by the Examiner's rejection, Boyle alone does not teach, show or suggest all of the limitations of the Applicants' claimed invention. As such, and since Gupta can not be properly combined with Boyle to support a §103 rejection of Applicants' claims, the Applicants submit that claims 1-6, 9-31 and 34 are not made obvious by the teachings of Gupta in view of Boyle. Therefore, the Applicants submit claims 1-6, 9-31 and 34 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and are patentable thereunder.

Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Serial No. 09/518,753
Page 13

B. Claims 32 and 33

The Examiner rejected claims 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta and Boyle and further in view of the Mangold et al. patent (United States Patent No. 5,926,232, issued July 20, 1999, hereinafter "Mangold"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Gupta is not proper prior art against Applicants' application. Since Boyle and Mangold alone do not teach, show or suggest all of the limitations of the Applicants' claimed invention, and since Gupta can not be properly combined with Boyle and Mangold to support a §103 rejection of Applicants' claims, the Applicants submit that claims 32 and 33 are not made obvious by the teachings of Gupta in view of Boyle and further in view of Mangold. Therefore, the Applicants submit that claims 32 and 33 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and are patentable thereunder.

II. CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application, is obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Response Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Serial No. 09/518,753
Page 14

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

7/7/05



Kin-Wah Tong
Reg. No. 39,400
(732) 530-9404

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Suite 100
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702